

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

RICHARD AND MARGARET GARNER

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff

(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, Telephone Number and Email Address)

Craig Thor Kimmel, Esquire
Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.
30 E. Butler Pike
Ambler, PA 19002
(215) 540-8888

DEFENDANTS

NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☒ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- | | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Foreign Nation | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 610 Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> 620 Other Food & Drug <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 630 Liquor Laws <input type="checkbox"/> 640 R.R. & Truck <input type="checkbox"/> 650 Airline Regs. <input type="checkbox"/> 660 Occupational Safety/Health <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other LABOR <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 810 Selective Service <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 892 Economic Stabilization Act <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 894 Energy Allocation Act <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes

V. ORIGIN

(Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☒ 1 Original Proceeding ☐ 2 Removed from State Court ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened ☐ 5 Transferred from another district (specify) ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation ☐ 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):

15 U.S.C SECTION 1692

Brief description of cause:

Fair Debt Collection Practices Act

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23

DEMAND \$

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: ☒ Yes ☐ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S)

(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

Explanation:

DATE

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

1-19-12

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: 1045 South Parkcrest Street, Gilbert, AZ 85296

Address of Defendant: 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, PA 19044

Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: _____

(Use Reverse Side For Additional Space)

Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?

(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))

Yes ☐ No ☒

Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?

Yes ☐ No ☒

RELATED CASE, IF ANY:

Case Number: _____ Judge _____ Date Terminated: _____

Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:

1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?
Yes ☐ No ☒
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?
Yes ☐ No ☒
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?
Yes ☐ No ☒
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?
Yes ☐ No ☒

CIVIL: (Place ☒ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)

A. Federal Question Cases:

1. ☐ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts
2. ☐ FELA
3. ☐ Jones Act-Personal Injury
4. ☐ Antitrust
5. ☐ Patent
6. ☐ Labor-Management Relations
7. ☐ Civil Rights
8. ☐ Habeas Corpus
9. ☐ Securities Act(s) Cases
10. ☐ Social Security Review Cases
11. ☒ All other Federal Question Cases 15 USC § 1602
(Please specify)

B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:

1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. ☐ Airplane Personal Injury
3. ☐ Assault, Defamation
4. ☐ Marine Personal Injury
5. ☐ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. ☐ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. ☐ Products Liability
8. ☐ Products Liability — Asbestos
9. ☐ All other Diversity Cases
(Please specify)

ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION

(Check Appropriate Category)

I, Craig Thor Kimmel, counsel of record do hereby certify:
☐ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;
☐ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.

DATE: 1-19-12

Attorney-at-Law

57100

Attorney I.D.#

NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

DATE: 1-19-12

Attorney-at-Law

57100

Attorney I.D.#

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Richard and Margaret Garner

CIVIL ACTION

v.

NCO Financial Systems, Inc.

NO.

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

- (a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. ()
- (b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ()
- (c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. (X)
- (d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. ()
- (e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) ()
- (f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks. ()

<u>1-19-12</u> Date	<u>Craig Thor Kimmel</u> Attorney-at-law	<u>Richard and Margaret Garner</u> Attorney for
<u>215-540-8888</u> Telephone	<u>877-788-2864</u> FAX Number	<u>kimmel@creditlaw.com</u> E-Mail Address

RICHARD AND MARGARET GARNER,)	
)	
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	Case No.:
)	
NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.,)	COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR
)	JURY TRIAL
Defendant)	
)	(Unlawful Debt Collection Practices)

RICHARD AND MARGARET GARNER (“Plaintiffs”), by and through their attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. (“Defendant”):

1. Plaintiffs' Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.* ("FDCPA").

2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before “any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy,” and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.

3. Defendant has its corporate headquarters in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and as such, personal jurisdiction is established.

4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

PARTIES

5. Plaintiffs are natural persons residing in Gilbert, Arizona.

6. Plaintiffs are persons granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a) and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).

7. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, PA 19044.

8. Defendant is a “debt collector” as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiffs in an attempt to collect a debt.

9. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

10. Defendant and others it retained constantly and continuously placed harassing and abusive collection calls to Plaintiffs throughout 2011 and earlier seeking and demanding payment for an alleged consumer debt of another person.

11. Upon information and belief, the alleged debt Defendant was seeking to collect arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.

12. Defendant, its employees and servants harassed Plaintiffs by making continuous calls to their home telephone number for almost two (2) years seeking to collect the debt of another person.

13. Defendant identified the debtor to Plaintiffs as “Scott Garner.”

14. Defendant regularly disclosed to Plaintiffs that it was a collection agency attempting to collect a debt from “Scott Garner.”

15. Many of Defendant’s collection calls originated from: (866) 637-0271, which the

undersigned has confirmed is a telephone number belonging to Defendant.

16. Plaintiffs have a son with the name "Scott Garner," but he does not live with Plaintiffs and has not lived with them for more than thirty (30) years.

17. Plaintiff's son does not reside in Arizona.

18. Plaintiffs spoke to their son about Defendant's repeated telephone calls, and he stated that he owed no debts.

19. Plaintiffs checked the phone book and learned that there are many other "Scott Garners" living in their area as well as near their son.

20. Wanting Defendant's repeated and continuous telephone calls to stop, on at least three (3) separate occasions, Plaintiffs spoke with Defendant and others it retained to advise that no one with the name "Scott Garner" lived at their residence and not to call them anymore.

21. Despite Plaintiff's instructions to stop calling them, Defendant continued to contact Plaintiff on a daily basis seeking and demanding payment of an alleged debt of another person.

22. Defendant failed to investigate or verify contact information prior to and after calling Plaintiffs.

23. Defendant failed to update its records to avoid further harassment of Plaintiffs.

24. Most recently, Defendant contacted Plaintiffs in December 2011.

25. The repetitive calls to Plaintiffs were disturbing, harassing, and an invasion of their privacy.

CONSTRUCTION OF LAW

26. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer

1 need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages.” Russell v.
2 Equifax A.R.S., 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp., 233
3 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector’s legal status
4 violated FDCPA); Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).

5 27. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in
6 favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The
7 remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit
8 & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). “Because the FDCPA, like the
9 Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 *et seq.*, is a remedial statute, it should be
10 construed liberally in favor of the consumer.” Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir.
11 2002).

12 28. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the “least sophisticated”
13 consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano
14 v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc.,
15 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not “made for the protection of experts, but for
16 the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous,
17 and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and
18 experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less
19 experienced.” Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it
20 ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection
21 practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of
22 collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.
23
24
25

COUNT I
DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE
FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

29. In its actions to collect a debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:

- a. Defendant violated the FDCPA generally;
- b. Defendant violated §1692b(2) of the FDCPA by informing Plaintiffs that “Scott Garner” owed a debt.
- c. Defendant violated §1692(b)(3) of the FDCPA by calling Plaintiffs more than once in connection for the collection of a debt for another individual.
- d. Defendant violated §1692c(b) of the FDCPA by communicating with Plaintiffs about a debt allegedly owed by Scott Garner.
- e. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiffs in connection with the collection of an alleged debt.
- f. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA by causing a telephone to ring and engaging Plaintiffs in telephone conversations repeatedly and continuously with the intent to annoy, abuse, and harass Plaintiffs.
- g. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiffs to collect or attempt to collect a debt.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, RICHARD AND MARGARET GARNER, respectfully pray for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);


- 1 b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to
2 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
3 c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation
4 costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
5 d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

6 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

7 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs, RICHARD AND MARGARET GARNER,
8 demand a jury trial in this case.

9 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

10
11 Date: 1-19-12

12 By: 
13 Craig Thor Kimmel
14 Attorney ID No. 57100
15 Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.
16 30 E. Butler Pike
17 Ambler, PA 19002
18 Phone: (215) 540-8888
19 Fax: (877) 788-2864
20 Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com